

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, Applicants amend the specification, the Title of the Invention, and independent claims 1 and 10 and dependent claims 11-17. Further, in view of the following remarks, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings, specification and claims for various formalities, and rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Coiera*. Applicants respectfully traverse the objections and rejections, and request allowance of claims 1-18.

**I. Comments on Information Disclosure Statement**

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that "US Applications are not appropriate to be listed on the 1449 Form." While the Examiner confirmed that all of the cited U.S. applications were considered, the Examiner stated that none of these applications will be included on the front page of the patent and, should any of the applications be related to the present application, then they should be listed in the specification.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's comments and reply by noting that none of the U.S. applications listed on the 1449 Form are related by priority to the present application. Accordingly, Applicants submit that it is not necessary to amend the specification to list the cited U.S. patent applications.

**II. Objections to the Drawings, Specification, and Claims**

The Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) since the reference character 150 in Figure 1 is not mentioned in the description. In view of this objection, the specification has been amended to include the reference character 150 (see page 3) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b).

With respect to the specification, the Examiner noted that the title of the invention is not descriptive. Applicants have amended the title of the invention to make it more descriptive. In particular, the title of the invention has been amended to: "Defining a Resource Template for Locating Relevant Resources."

The Examiner also objected to the specification for containing various informalities on page 1, paragraph [0013]. However, Applicants cannot locate in paragraph [0013] the informalities the Examiner objected to. Instead, such informalities exist in paragraph [0008] and, as a result, Applicants have amended that paragraph in accordance with the Examiner's proposed revisions concerning the terms "forth" (at line 2) and "refers" (at line 3).

Finally, the Examiner objected to claims 10-17 for containing an informality with respect to the phrase "to a cause a machine." Applicants have amended claims 10-17 to correct this informality and, therefore, request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

**III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Coiera*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

*Coiera* relates to a method for searching for information available from one or more data sources. *Coiera*, however, fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of the claims. Among other things, *Coiera* fails to disclose or teach a method including “associating a set of constraints with the attributes, the constraints corresponding to a context and being defined by a resource template and determining that a resource matches the set of attributes and constraints,” as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 10.

Contrary to the Examiner’s assertions, *Coiera* does not correlate a set of constraints to a specific context. Further, *Coiera* does not define such a set of constraints using a resource template, as claimed. In the Office Action, paragraph 0055 and FIG. 6 of *Coiera* are highlighted to support the rejections, but these references do not disclose or teach the noted claim limitations. While *Coiera* arguably discloses changing profile parameter values (what the Examiner apparently equates to the “set of constraints”), nowhere does *Coiera* mention “the constraints corresponding to a context,” as claimed. Further, as noted above, *Coiera* does not disclose a “resource template” that defines the set of constraints. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 10 are patentable over *Coiera*.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a reference must teach every element of the claim.<sup>1</sup> For the reasons expressed above, *Coiera* fails to disclose or teach every limitation recited in independent claims 1 and 10. Since claims 1 and 10 are allowable, based on at least the above reasons, dependent claims 2-9 and 11-18 are also patentable over *Coiera*. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and that claims 1-18 be allowed in the next official communication from the Office.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

---

<sup>1</sup> MPEP section 2131, p. 70 (Feb. 2003, Rev. 1). See also, *Ex parte Levy*, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1462 (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. 1990) (to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, the Examiner must identify where "each and every facet of the claimed invention is disclosed in the applied reference."); *Glaverbel Société Anonyme v. Northlake Mktg. & Supply, Inc.*, 45 F.3d 1550, 1554 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (anticipation requires that each claim element must be identical to a corresponding element in the applied reference); *Atlas Powder Co. v. E.I. duPont De Nemours*, 750 F.2d 1569, 1574 (1984) (the failure to mention "a claimed element (in) a prior art reference is enough to negate anticipation by that reference").

Customer No. 22,852  
Application No. 10/663,365  
Attorney Docket No. 09282.0014-00  
SAP Reference No. 2003P00138 US01

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'C' followed by a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke.

Dated: February 2, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
C. Gregory Gramenopoulos  
Reg. No. 36,532